

REMARKS

The Office Action of December 29, 2006 has been received and carefully reviewed.

In response, claims 30, 32-36, 38, 40, and 41 have been amended above to address formalities related to the claim objections and rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112 whereby no new matter has been introduced. The specification has been amended above to correct a misspelled word on page 1 and to provide a substitute Abstract as requested on page 2 of the Office Action. In addition, Applicant has filed a supplemental IDS by a separate paper citing the DE references discussed in the specification and mentioned on page 2 of the Office Action, whereby consideration of these references is requested in further examination of the application. Applicant notes with appreciation the indications in the Office Action that the drawings filed on February 11, 2005 have been accepted and that the certified copies of the priority documents have been received. Reconsideration of the application and the pending claims is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

I. IDS

The Office Action indicated that the references listed in the specification needed to be submitted *via* an IDS for consideration. Applicant has accordingly submitted a supplemental IDS including the three DE references discussed in the specification, and respectfully requests consideration of the cited references in the next Office Communication.

II. SPECIFICATION

The Office Action on page 2 objected to the specification, in particular, the Abstract. Applicant has accordingly amended the abstract above in accordance with the recommendations in the Office Action, and respectfully requests reconsideration thereof.

III. CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Claims 30, 32-34, 36, and 38 were objected to on page 3 of the Office Action based on various informalities. In the above amendment, these claims have been amended to address the objections in accordance with the recommendations of the Office Action, whereby reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections to these claims is respectfully requested.

IV. CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 30, 35, 40, and 41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter regarded as the invention. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested under 35 U.S.C. §112 for at least the following reasons. In the above amendment, claims 30, 35, 40, and 41 were amended to remove the occurrences of "in particular", and other clarifying amendments were made whereby these claims are now definite within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

V. CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 30-38, 40, and 42-44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by Baumann 5,606,839. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested under 35 U.S.C. §103 for at least the following reasons. Independent claim 30 and dependent claims 31-38, 40, and 42-44 are directed to joining connections for hydraulic or pneumatic working devices, which is not the case in Baumann. In particular, independent claim 30 has been amended above to recite a first part of a hydraulic or pneumatic operating device having an outer wall section, as well as a second part of a hydraulic or pneumatic operating device having an inner wall section. The first and second parts recited in amended claim 30 are each part of hydraulic or pneumatic operating devices. Examples of such are illustrated and described in Applicants drawings and specification including without limitation cylinders and sealing rings of a multistage

hydraulic operating ram, piston rods and rings, shield support props, cylinder tube sections and covers, etc. Baumann fails to teach or suggest anything with respect to hydraulic or pneumatic operating devices, being instead directed to energy dissipating connections for connecting rebar members together. Therefore, the above amendments to claim 30 patentably distinguish the pending claims 30-38, 40, and 42-44 from Baumann, whereby Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of these claims under 35 U.S.C. §102.

VI. CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 39 and 41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable in view of Baumann and Baumann combined with DeJong 5,037,234. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested under 35 U.S.C. §103 for at least the following reasons.

Claim 39 depends from independent claim 30 discussed above, and accordingly comprises a first part of a hydraulic or pneumatic operating device having an outer wall section, as well as a second part of a hydraulic or pneumatic operating device having an inner wall section. As these elements are neither taught nor suggested in Baumann, claim 39 is now believed to be patentably distinct from Baumann and reconsideration thereof is requested under 35 U.S.C. §103.

Claim 41 also depends from independent claim 30. As discussed above, Baumann fails to teach or fairly suggest a first part of a hydraulic or pneumatic operating device having an outer wall section, as well as a second part of a hydraulic or pneumatic operating device having an inner wall section as recited in independent claim 30. DeJong fails to remedy this deficiency of Baumann, wherein DeJong relates instead to wood connections in which two wood members are glued together using dowels. Therefore, neither Baumann nor DeJong, nor the proposed combination thereof teaches or suggests all the features of dependent claim 41 whereby reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 41 is respectfully requested under 35 U.S.C. §103.

CONCLUSION

For at least the above reasons, the currently pending claims are believed to be in condition for allowance and notice thereof is requested.

Should the Examiner feel that a telephone interview would be helpful to facilitate favorable prosecution of the above-identified application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number provided below.

Should any fees be due as a result of the filing of this response, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the Deposit Account Number 06-0308, SHEE200049.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> One or more fees may be paid via credit card through the electronic filing system (EFS-Web) in association with this submission. If any additional fee is determined to be due as a result of the filing of this submission, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any such additional fees associated with this submission to Deposit Account Number 06-0308.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Should any extensions of time under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a)(1)-(5) be required for this submission, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any such extension of time fees to Deposit Account Number 06-0308.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> This submission is being filed on the date indicated below by electronic transmission with the United States Patent and Trademark Office via the electronic filing system (EFS-Web).

Respectfully submitted,

FAY SHARPE LLP

/Eric Highman/
Eric Highman, Reg. No. 43,672
1100 Superior Avenue
Seventh Floor
Cleveland, OH 44114-2579
216-861-5582